

## **REMARKS**

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and further examination are requested. Upon entry of this amendment, the specification is amended, the abstract is amended, claims 1, 4, 11, and 15-19 are amended, and claims 2, 3, 5-10, 12, 13 and 14 are cancelled, leaving claim 1, 4, 11, and 15-19 pending with claims 1 and 11 being independent. No new matter has been added.

### ***Specification***

The specification and abstract have been carefully reviewed and revised to correct grammatical and idiomatic errors in order to aid the Examiner in further consideration of the application. The amendments to the specification and abstract are incorporated in the attached substitute specification. No new matter has been added.

Also, attached hereto is a marked up version of the changes made to the specification and abstract by the current amendment. The attachment is captioned "Version with Markings to Show Changes Made."

### ***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)***

Claims 1-4, 11-15, 18 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamamoto (JP 2003184994).

Applicants submit that the claims as now pending are allowable over the cited prior art. Specifically, amended independent claim 1 now recites a rotating assembly wherein a large-diameter escape portion in an inner hole of a rotating member is disposed inward of one of first and second locations on the outer circumferential surface of the rotating member, and the large-diameter escape portion is configured to prevent contact with the outer circumferential surface of a shaft when the rotating member is fixed to the shaft, wherein the escape portion has a circumferential length that is at least equal to a circumferential length of two adjacent grooves of a plurality of grooves, and wherein the plurality of grooves and the escape portion extend through the entire thickness of the rotating member.

The cited prior art fails to disclose or render obvious such a rotating assembly. In particular Yamamoto discloses cam piece 20 that has crevices 24 that mate with convex part 13 of boss 23, and has notches 25. However, Applicants submit that Yamamoto fails to disclose an

escape portion that has a circumferential length that is at least equal to a circumferential length of two adjacent grooves of the plurality of grooves, as required by independent claim 1 of the present application. In fact, each of the crevices 24 in Yamamoto is substantially the same length. Moreover, the notches 25 do not extend through the entire thickness of the rotating member, as required by independent claim 1 of the present application.

Moreover, there is no reasoning in the prior art to modify Yamamoto such that it would have rendered independent claim 1 obvious. Any such reasoning would have involved improper hindsight. Therefore, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over the cited prior art.

Applicants submit that independent claim 11 and its dependent claims are allowable for similar reasons to those set forth above. Namely, the cited prior art fails to disclose or render obvious a rotating assembly wherein a large-diameter escape portion in an inner hole of a rotating member is disposed inward of one of first and second locations, and the large-diameter escape portion is configured to prevent contact with an outer circumferential surface of a shaft when the rotating member is fastened to the shaft, wherein the escape portion has a circumferential length that is at least equal to a circumferential length of two adjacent grooves of a plurality of grooves, and wherein the plurality of grooves and the escape portion extend throughout the thickness of the rotating member, as recited in independent claim 11.

### ***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)***

Claims 4 and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto in view of Arnold et al. (US 5,207,120).

Applicants submit that since claims 4 and 15 are dependent from claims 1 and 11, respectively, and since Arnold fails to overcome the deficiencies of Yamamoto discussed above, claims 4 and 15 are allowable for the reasons set forth above.

### ***Conclusion***

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all of the claims now pending in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe there are any remaining issues that must be resolved before this application can be allowed, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Tamotsu YAMAMOTO et al.

/Jeffrey J. Howell/

By 2010.11.09 13:22:31 -05'00'

Jeffrey J. Howell

Registration No. 46,402

Attorney for Applicants

JJH/ete

Washington, D.C. 20005-1503

Telephone (202) 721-8200

Facsimile (202) 721-8250

November 9, 2010